DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 320 880 SP 032 434

AUTHOR Kroll, Linda; And Others
TITLE The Effect of a School-University Partnership on the Student Teaching Experience.
PUB DATE Apr 90
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 17-20, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; *Master Teachers; Preservice Teacher Education; Program Evaluation; Schools of Education; *Student Teachers; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

A partnership program involving student teachers at Mills College (California) and a local public school is described. The purposes of the program are to provide a concerted, coordinated effort in inservice education for classroom teachers; to provide an arena where both college faculty and school faculty can experiment in putting theory into practice; and to define and refine the role of the master teacher in the professional training sphere. A study examined the effect of the partnership on the student teacher and the master teacher in the classroom. The subjects of the study were 6 teachers from the partnership school who have served as master teachers, the 6 master teachers from a nearby school where student teachers from Mills had and continue to have field experience, and the 13 Mills teacher education graduates who had field experiences at the partnership school. Data were gathered via questionnaires. Findings indicate that the effect of the partnership had the strongest positive effect on partnership master teachers who acquired a broader sense of professionalism. For the student teacher, the benefits of the partnership were reflected in a deepening understanding of the teaching profession. Copies of the questionnaires are appended. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED320880

The Effect of a School-University Partnership on the Student Teaching Experience

by

Linda Kroll
Department of Education
Mills College

Marty Rutherford
Teacher, John Swett Elementary School
Oakland Unified School District

Jane Bowyer
Department of Education
Mills College

Margaret Hauben
Principal, John Swett Elementary School
Oakland Unified School District
and
Department of Education
Mills College

Paper to be presented at the Annual Convention of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, Massachusetts, April, 1990.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L Knoll

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP 032 434

The notion of school-university collaboration is not new in American education. As early as the late nineteenth century, members of both educational communities came together for the good of educating American youth (Clark, 1988; Wesley, 1957). During the past century, however, a separation between institutions of higher learning and the public schools has been the norm. Schools and universities continue to share the responsibilities of preparing new teachers to enter the field of teaching, but they do so in separate camps. Institutions of higher learning have been responsible for educating prospective teachers in theory and methodology, while the public school classroom has served as a place for modeling teaching strategies and as a practice ground for prospective teachers to try out teaching. While the student teacher may be supervised by a college faculty member, as well as by the master teacher in classroom, the relationship between college faculty and public schools has often been brief and limited in scope and substance.

During the last decade there has been a resurgence of school-university partnerships and collaborations brought on by the call for educational reform (Carnegie, 1986; Clark, 1988; Heckman, 1988). Born out of necessity, there is a growing realization that closer, more collaborative connections can benefit all parties; college faculty, public school faculty, student teachers and public school students (Goodlad, 1985; Gifford & Gabelko, 1987; Heckman, 1988; Williams, 1988). College faculty have an opportunity to become more informed about current classroom practice; public school faculty have the opportunity to become more informed and involved in current educational research; both faculties can contribute more effectively to teacher education if they are more familiar with each other's area of expertise. Classroom teaching techniques can be informed by the latest research. College course

content can be informed by the reality of the classroom. A positive outcome is improvement of public school education for children.

Most partnerships are initiated at the university level (Gifford, 1987; Goodlad, 1988; Heckman, 1988) where the notion of research lends itself to the examination of the school community. Furthermore, it is at the university level that one comes in contact with the ways and means of recruiting funding and resources for financing expensive and long term projects. Frequently, partnerships which survive over a long period of time have a consistent means of financial support (Goodlad, 1988); however, a determination to continue with or with out financial backing is essential. Successful partnerships do not exist because of funding, but because there is a motivation beyond the partnership which demands they continue: A sincere desire to be part of school renewal.

Problems experienced by school-university partnerships are similar to problems felt by partnerships in most fields where diverse groups come together to collaborate. As Goodlad (1988), Clark (1988), and Schlechty and Whitford (1988) so accurately point out, the nature and culture of the schools and the teacher education institutions are quite different and operate on different sets of needs, assumptions and goals, with different reward and credit systems. Conflicts arise around goals, accountability and rewards. At the university level, little credit is given towards advancement for working in professional rather than research oriented work. At the public school level, little credit is given toward advancement in working with teacher education or educational research. Teachers, university faculty members, and administrators come to partnerships with set agendas and priorities. It is often difficult to refocus the partnership and/or collaboration on a set of

mutually agreed upon criteria and goals (Gifford, 1987; Goodlad, 1988; Heckman, 1988; Williams, 1988).

Communication and a means of understanding one another is a constant struggle fraught with frustration. The inherent belief on the part of classroom teachers is that members of institutions of higher learning are too far removed from the classroom to understand the intricacies involved in orchestrating the education of children. Researchers, conversely, feel shut out of the classroom by teachers who are intimidated by having "experts" open the doors which have been traditionally closed (Goodlad, 1984). Neither party thinks the other can make the connections between theory and practice effectively. Therefore, partnerships have found that the first step that they must take in order to create a successful environment for collaboration is to constantly attend to making the lines of communication open, dedicating, "quality time to engage in reflective practice--to bring together knowledge, inquiry and action" (Goodlad, 1988, p.).

For the past three and a half years, Mills College's Department of Education has worked in a partnership with John Swett Elementary School, a small, neighboring, inner city school with a culturally diverse, low socioeconomic population, in the Oakland Unified School District, in Oakland, California. The partnership has been funded by the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation. The purpose of the partnership has been manifold: to provide for a concerted, coordinated effort in inservice education for Oakland classroom teachers; to provide an arena where both college faculty and school faculty can experiment in putting theory into practice with particular curriculum, both for school-age students and prospective teachers; to define and refine the role of the master teacher in the

education of new teachers; and to provide a center for student teaching that is closely linked with the college and the college curriculum.

While most partnerships have involved several school districts in league with large institutions of teacher education (e.g. UC Berkeley with three neighboring school districts) (Sirotnik and Goodlad, 1988), the partnership of Mills College with the Oakland school district has been more limited in size. The small size of the two institutions involved in the partnership has allowed for more intimate working relationships between the faculties. It is interesting to note, however, that the issues and conflicts that arise in the larger school-university partnerships described in Sirotnik and Goodlad, 1988, occur in microcosm in the smaller partnership described here. The issues of trust, self-interest, and conflict of interest are all at issue at Mills and John Swett, just as they were in New York (Lieberman, 1988), Massachusetts (Sinclair & Harrison, 1988), Utah (Williams, 1988), and Berkeley (Gifford & Gabelko, 1987). These conflicts have arisen in our work together in Oakland. However, the smallness and intimacy of our collaboration has permitted us to confront these issues and overcome them, repeatedly, to create what we believe is a good arena for the education of teachers at all levels; preservice teacher, experienced teacher and professor of education.

The Mills-Oakland partnership is founded on the belief that both professors of education and experienced public school teachers have much to offer both to preservice teachers and to young students in classrooms. The aim of the partnership is to create a new model for teacher education, where teacher knowledge is defined by teachers and professors. The role of the master teacher is transformed into the role of clinical professor, not unlike the role of the doctor or lawyer or businessperson in their respective

professional training spheres (Goodlad, 1988). In founding the partnership, one unique supporting factor was the support of both the Mills College administration, and the Oakland Unified School District school board and administration. Certain conditions were agreed to as a basis for working together; these conditions were characterized by a strong element of choice on the part of all participants in the partnership. For example, faculty who came to both the college education department and the school teaching staff chose to come in order to participate in the partnership. In addition, interviewing and selection for all hiring was and is shared. The principal of John Swett Elementary School is also a faculty member in the college department of education, teaches courses in the teacher education program, and supervises student teachers. The coordinator of the partnership is a college faculty member, and spends time with children in the John Swett classrooms.

After three and a half years of developing as a partnership, we are ready to begin reviewing and assessing the effect of the partnership. This particular paper will examine the effect of the partnership on the student teaching experience, for the preservice teacher and the master teacher in the classroom. The basic hypothesis of the study is that the partnership facilitates student and master teacher development; i.e. that the student teaching experience in a partnership school is more effective for both the student teacher and the master teacher than in a non-partnership school. This preliminary study is designed to take an intimate look at how well this particular aspect of the partnership is working.

Methods

Subjects

We have three subsets of subjects in the study: (1) the six teachers from the partnership school who have served as master teachers; (2) the six master

teachers from a nearby, Oakland school where student teachers from Mills have had and continue to have field experiences; (3) the 13 Mills' teacher education graduates who had field experiences at the partnership school during the last two years, as well as at other sites. The master teachers represent a variety of teaching experience within the Oakland schools, ranging in length of service from four years to twenty-five years.

Procedures

Questionnaires were sent to all teachers at Swett and to the teachers at the other Oakland school who had served as master teachers during the years of the partnership. Questionnaires were also sent to the 13 graduates who had been at Mills. The teacher questionnaires asked the master teachers to reflect on their role as master teacher and on their relationship to the College. The partnership teachers were also asked questions about the role of the partnership. The student teacher questionnaire asked the graduates to compare their field experience at Swett with other field experiences they had had, and to reflect on the positive and negative aspects of field experiences in general. (The complete questionnaires are contained in Appendix 1).

Results and Discussion

Obtaining results from the three different subject groups was differentially successful. All of the partnership teachers responded to the questionnaire (N=6). Of the six nonpartnership teachers, two responded, despite numerous mailings and personal phone calls to persuade the teachers to return the questionnaire (N=2). Out of thirteen graduates, seven responded (N=7). Despite the limited response from the nonpartnership master teachers, the questionnaire answers give us a rich source of data for

considering the effect of the partnership on the student teaching experience, both for student teachers and for master teachers.

We have divided the results and discussion into three sections: (1) to compare partnership teachers' responses with those of the nonpartnership teachers; (2) to consider the student teachers' experience of the partnership; and (3) to consider the partnership teachers' view of the effect of the partnership on the master teacher role.

Master teacher responses: Results

Master teachers were questioned on three different issues: (1) the role of the master teacher in relation to the student teacher; (2) the role of the master teacher in relation to the College; and (3) the role of the master teacher in relation to the school district and colleagues.

The role of the master teacher in relationship to the student teacher. Master teachers were asked to give their reasons for becoming master teachers. The responses fell into four general categories which we labeled *for the children, for myself, for the student teacher,* and *for the good of education.* Most teachers gave more than one reason for choosing to act as a master teacher. The strongest response of the partnership teachers was *for the student teachers,* with *for myself* also a strong response. The nonpartnership teachers each gave two responses over all four of the categories. One teacher was more focused on herself and her children, while the other was focused on the student teacher and the broader context of education. Two of the partnership teachers also gave the partnership as one of their reasons for choosing the master teacher role. (See Table 1 for a summary of the responses).

Master teachers at both schools gave responses which fell into six categories in describing their role and responsibilities as master teachers. The

partnership teachers' responses fit into three additional categories that were not mentioned by the nonpartnership teachers. Each master teacher saw herself as a guide, model or support person. Half of each group identified the translation of theory to practice as one of their major responsibilities. Half of each group said part of their job as a master teacher was to take the role seriously, to provide planning time and to treat the student teacher in a professional manner. In addition, partnership teachers identified their responsibilities toward the student teacher as extending beyond the classroom, helping students to appreciate and seriously regard the variety and diversity of students, roles and responsibilities available in teaching. (See Table 1 for a summary of responses).

Master teachers were also asked about their sense of role and responsibility toward other student teachers at their schools. All but one of the partnership teachers regarded themselves as responsible for those student teachers to varying degrees and in different ways. The nonpartnership master teachers said they could be a resource for the other student teachers, but made no indication that they regarded these other student teachers in any way as their responsibility.

The role of the master teacher in relation to Mills College. Partnership master teachers saw their relationship to the college as one of being integrally involved in planning, implementing and evaluating the teacher education program. In addition they saw part of their responsibility to the college as being responsible to the partnership. The nonpartnership master teachers felt much less responsibility to the program, only one mentioning some responsibility to help the student teacher carry out assignments. Both sets of teachers indicated minimal or no knowledge of the coursework. The partnership teachers indicated that such knowledge would be useful, while

the nonpartnership teachers did not. Four out of six of the partnership teachers indicated that they had made suggestions for program revisions, and that their suggestions had been acted on. One non-partnership master teacher indicated that she had repeatedly made suggestions, but she felt they had been ignored. (See Table 2 for a summary of responses.)

The role of the master teacher in relation to the school district and to the master teacher's colleagues. The master teachers were asked how having a student teacher affected their relationship to the school district and to their colleagues. Partnership teachers indicated that having a student teacher affected their relationship with their colleagues much more than with the school district, although two of them saw the role of master teacher as changing their status or relationship to the district. Nonpartnership teachers said that having a student teacher had no effect on their relationships with either the school district or their colleagues. (See Table 3 for a summary of responses).

Master Teacher Responses: Discussion

It is clear from the responses that partnership and nonpartnership teachers take their responsibilities as master teachers seriously. They choose to become master teachers for their own professional growth and for the sake of others, although not all of them see their responsibilities as being toward the student teacher. While most master teachers gave *the student teacher* as one reason for becoming a master teacher, one nonpartnership master teacher chose to be a master teacher for her children and for herself. Most master teachers choose the role to extend themselves beyond their own classrooms for the future of education.

It is in addressing the role and responsibilities of the master teacher that the differences between the two groups of teachers begin to become

apparent. Only the partnership teachers see part of their role as providing student teachers with a broader picture of the educational world, beyond the immediate classroom. For example, in response to the question *How do you view your role as a master teacher?* one teacher responded: "Hopefully, to erase some of the "stereotypical" attitudes about teaching in a multicultural, inner-city school." This teacher has the needs of the broader educational context in mind in making such a commitment. The partnership teachers see themselves as resources and as providing the student teacher with a place to experiment with teaching, indicating a professional relationship with student teachers; a sense of professionalism that becomes more apparent as we continue to examine the data. On the other hand, the nonpartnership teachers view their role traditionally, as providing teaching models and a practice ground.

Understandably, partnership teachers see themselves as much more responsible to the college program than do the nonpartnership teachers. The nonpartnership teachers reflect the traditional attitudes of hostility and distance from the college despite their long association as master teachers with the Mills teacher education programs. Partnership teachers, on the other hand, feel responsible for the college program. When asked about the changes she had suggested for the program, one partnership teacher responded : "Our ideas develop and evolve, so that I'm not sure which I originated. We take an idea and interact. It evolves." This sense of an ongoing dialogue between the members of the partnership about the teacher education programs is reflected in many of the responses to this section. The nonpartnership teachers do not feel this sense of collaboration and dialogue. Reflecting again their commitment to the college program, partnership teachers are articulate about the need to be familiar with the coursework.

They understand the necessity of a link between the college and the classroom, and feel it is their responsibility to take on that role.

A sense of isolation and disconnection is reflected in the responses to the final set of questions for this section: how having a student teacher affects the master teacher's relationship to her colleagues and to the school district. Neither group of teachers finds that having a student teacher affects their relationship with the school district. In regards to colleaguial relations, however, the partnership teachers and nonpartnership teachers are in complete disagreement with each other. Partnership teachers say having a student teacher increases their contact with each other by promoting dialogue, problem-solving, positive relationships and professional growth. The nonpartnership teachers, in spite of being at a school where several students are assigned simultaneously, do not find that sharing the responsibility of educating future teachers creates a colleaguial bond.

Student Teacher Responses: Results

Former student teachers were asked to reflect and respond on two major issues: (1) to compare their different student teaching experiences; and (2) to reflect on the effect of the partnership on their student teaching experience (including reflecting on the role of the partnership school principal as principal, student teacher supervisor and professor).

Student teaching experiences. Students reported both positive and negative experiences in both student teaching placements. Overall, the experience at the partnership school was not overwhelmingly worse or better than their experiences at other schools. However, they identified certain positive effects apparent at Swett, that were not apparent in their other experiences. (See Table 4 for a summary of positive and negative aspects of the student teaching experiences).

Positive aspects of the partnership school experience shared by more than two student teachers included: support from the master teacher; being treated professionally; and being included in the school community. Only the student population was cited by more than two students as a positive aspect of the other experience. No negative aspects of either the partnership or nonpartnership school experiences were shared by more than two students. All negative experiences cited were those typically cited by student teachers, (e.g. difficulty in communicating with the master teacher, feeling isolated, the teaching conditions etc.) Only one student stated that a certain discomfort with the Mills/Swett relationship affected her student teaching experience negatively.

Students were asked about their interactions with other teachers in both schools. A striking difference between the partnership and the nonpartnership school is apparent. All the student teachers had contact with other teachers at the partnership school. Four students had contact with teachers at their other schools, but qualified their responses by indicating the narrow limits of this contact. At the partnership school, the contact with the other teachers was classed as collaboration, again an indication that the faculty at the partnership school treated the student teachers in a more professional manner than did the teachers at other schools. (See Table 4 for a summary of these responses.)

Students indicated that at both sites administrators interacted with them by observing them, giving them advice and providing them with information.

The effect of the partnership on the student teaching experience. Students were asked about the master teacher's knowledge of their coursework and about their experience of the relationship between Mills

College and John Swett school. Students thought that master teachers had little, if any, knowledge of the college coursework. The sense of relationship between John Swett School and Mills College was divided. Students from one year felt that the relationship was very positive and collaborative. Students from the other year felt that that there was animosity and tension between the two faculties, and they felt caught in the middle.

Student teacher experiences: Discussion

Student teachers felt more included in the partnership school and felt treated more professionally by the faculty. The master teachers included them in the school community, and they felt as if they were an integral part of the staff. For example, one student wrote about the positive aspects of working as Swett: "Working in a supportive environment with teachers who seemed to understand my role there and earnestly tried to give me their best...*(I alsways felt)* included in the staff room, meetings, like real members of the school community." Also, the fact that all the master teachers felt responsible for all the student teachers on some level, seems clearly reflected in the students sense of belonging to the school, and in their sense of available opportunities for trying out a variety of curriculum in different classrooms.

Student teachers' relationships with the administrators in the partnership and non-partnership school differed. At the nonpartnership school, the principal offered advice and information, but was largely uninvolved in the student teachers' training. At the partnership school, the principal served as the supervisor for the students while they were at the school, and also taught the Curriculum and Instruction course at the college. Hence, students had higher expectations for the involvement of the partnership principal. Most of them considered that her bridge role between

the school and the college had a positive effect on their student teaching experience, because she was so knowledgeable about all aspects of the program.

The Effect of the Partnership on the Master Teacher Role: Results

Two aspects of the effect of the partnership on the master teacher were considered in this study: (1) the opportunities provided by the partnership; and (2) the effect of the multiple roles played by the principal.

Opportunities provided by the partnership. All six partnership teachers reported that the partnership provided them with expanded opportunities. Some said that they had a broader view of themselves as educators. They also reported that the partnership provided opportunities for professional growth by exposing them to the latest research and curriculum possibilities, and also by including them in multiple roles of educator, researcher, practitioner. (See Table 5 for a summary of these responses.)

The effect of the multiple roles played by the principal. All of the teachers see the role played by the principal as crucial to the success of the partnership. They see her as providing a strong link between themselves and their student teachers. They see her as facilitating college/school relations and as supportive of both the John Swett faculty and the Mills faculty. They also see her as the bridge between the college and the school. She plays a focal role in that she teaches the student teachers, supervises them at the partnership school and supervises the master teachers. Over the period of the partnership her course load and supervision load at the College have fluctuated. When her teaching assignment was changed this fall, the partnership teachers were upset.

The Effect of the Partnership on the Master Teacher Role: Discussion.

Two major responses are apparent from this part of the investigation. First, the teachers regard participation in the partnership as granting them more professional status and providing them with greater opportunities to contribute to education beyond their crucial role in the classroom. One teacher said "Opportunities are endless; I feel we can create our own. Mills has encouraged this." Another teacher said "I feel I am part of a larger educational process, able to develop policies that impact on a broader scale." Such responses indicate the empowerment that the partnership has provided these teachers.

Secondly, the partnership teachers see the multiple roles played by the principal as crucial to the success of the student teacher-master teacher experience at the partnership school. "It has been a blessing to have such a supportive principal/supervisor. She has provided the bridge between the student teacher and master teacher. She has listened to the teachers' concerns and provided the student teachers with practical activities."; and "It is very helpful to have my student teacher's supervisor be someone I work with intimately. We can discuss what is going on, what problems they [the student teachers] are having, how I can help them." On the other hand, the teachers were very concerned this year when the principal was assigned to teach a different class at the college. They saw the change in her program as a demotion to a lower status, and, consequently, considered that the partnership, itself, was being considered less seriously. This response is consistent with the research information on the importance of maintaining open lines of communication (Sirotnik and Goodlad, 1988). The principal is the primary source of communication between the school and the college. She is the only person entrenched in both institutions. When

communication falters with her it can upset the whole program, because the teachers feel that an essential trust has been broken.

Conclusion

The effect of this school university partnership on the student teaching experience for master teachers and student teachers seems to have the strongest effect on partnership master teachers. The partnership teachers are empowered by the partnership, because they feel themselves to be involved in a wider educational venture that does not end and begin at the classroom door, but rather extends to a larger community including teacher education and educational research concerning school age children. They take a broader view of the role of master teacher than do their colleagues at the nonpartnership school, considering themselves professionals involved in teacher education at many levels. They feel they are a viable part of the academic community as shown through their continual input into the teacher education program at Mills. They act as clinical professors, taking responsibility for a group of students and serving as a resource for the whole Mills community. They feel respected by the Mills faculty, and trusted to define for themselves those arenas they want to investigate and develop.

Partnership teachers do not feel the sense of isolation that so many teachers report (Goodlad, 1985). Sharing responsibility for educating teachers encourages the teachers to reach out to each other to confer about the student's development, about program problems and eventually about issues other than the student teachers (Darling-Hammond, 1988).

While nonpartnership teachers give the same reasons for becoming master teachers as the partnership teachers, their experience and sense of themselves as teachers does not seem altered by the master teacher

experience. None of the development, such as a greater sense of self as a professional and of affecting the broader educational picture, expressed by the partnership teachers appears in the data of the nonpartnership teachers. Another indication of the nonpartnership teachers sense of isolation from the teacher education process is the fact that four out of six of the respondents failed to answer the questionnaire. Even the two who did respond indicated a lack of connection with the program, although they were clearly making an effort to improve that connection.

For the student teachers, the benefits of the partnership reflect the benefits for the master teachers. They, too, feel like professionals. Such a sense of professionalism helps them to take their education and goals more seriously and to begin to see the larger picture of education. Their sense of connection to the partnership school is strong. After they are employed as teachers, they come back to meet with the principal to discuss their classrooms and their professional questions.

It is not possible to end this discussion without addressing some of the problems that are apparent in the partnership. We began our discussion of partnerships by discussing other schools and universities experiences with partnering attempts. All partnerships suffer from communication difficulties, and the bulk of the literature addresses those problems. We, too, have communication difficulties, that the student teachers notice and are sensitive to. However, we have addressed that problem very directly this year and are coming to realize that it is simply part of the process of two very different institutions attempting to work together for common and individual goals. The master teachers have recognized the importance of having a person like their principal who acts as a bridge between the two institutions, but have also come to realize that they themselves can address

problems that until this year they have left to the principal to handle. The lines of communication are fragile; hence there is a need for many lines of communication. Paradoxically, the small size of the partnership makes many lines of communication possible. Teachers and professors can be involved in the partnership in multiple roles. The student teacher-master teacher connection is only one aspect of the partnership relationship. Important as it is, it can not be the only connection. There are many different ways for classroom teachers and college professors to collaborate for the benefit of children's education. As a partnership, we are beginning to examine these paths of collaboration.

This preliminary review of the Mills-Oakland partnership is consistent with our primary goal which was to build a model for school-university partnerships which have a teacher education component. In taking a fine-grained view of the the history of our partnership, we are able to see what is working and what changes need to be implemented.

Table 1

The Role of the Master Teacher in Relation to the Student Teacher

Partnership teachers (N=6)

Nonpartnership teachers (N=2)

Responses	Partnership Teachers[a]	Nonpartnership Teachers
Reasons for being a Master Teacher		
For the children	2	1
For myself	4	1
For the student teacher	5	1
For the good of education	3	1
For the partnership	2	NA
Role and Responsibilities of a Master Teacher		
To act as a guide	3	1
To act as a model	3	1
To provide support	3	1
To translate theory to practice	3	1
To treat the relationship seriously	3	1
To evaluate	2	1
To provide a place to teach	3	0
Beyond the classroom	3	0
To act as a resource	2	0

[a] Numbers indicate number of subjects in each category who made this response.

Table 2

The Role of the Master Teacher in Relation to the College

Partnership teachers N=6

Nonpartnership teachers N=2

Response	Partnership Teachers[a]	Nonpartnership Teachers
Responsibilities to the College		
Plan the program	2	0
Implement the program	3	1
Evaluate the program	2	0
Translate theory to practice	2	0
Complete paperwork	0	1
Responsibility to the Partnership		
Keep communication open	3	
Knowledge of Coursework		
None	2	1
A little	4	1
Knowledge of Coursework effects Interaction with Student Teacher		
It would if I knew more	5	0
Not important	1	2

[a] Numbers indicate the number of subjects in each category who made this response.

Table 2 continued

Program Suggestions		
None	1	1
Collaboration	1	0
Increase student teacher observation time	3	0
Multicultural/bilingual education	1	0
Before school year session	1	0
Discussion sessions for ST & MT	1	0
Reorganize the program	1	1
Suggestions acted on or implemented		
yes	3	0
no	1	1

(Note: partnership teachers who made suggestions, N=4)

Evaluate the success of the suggestion		
Negative but foresee growth	2	0
Foresee growth	1	0

Table 3

The Role of the Master Teacher in Relation to the School District and to her Colleagues

Partnership teachers N=6

Nonpartnership teachers N=2

Response	Partnership Teachers[a]	Nonpartnership Teachers
How it affects the relationship with the district		
Not at all	4	2
Higher status	1	0
Helps the district	1	0
How it affects my relationship with my colleagues		
Not at all	1	2
Dialogue/Problem-solving	2	0
Promotes a positive relationship	4	0
Provides for professional growth	2	0

[a] Numbers indicate number of subjects in each category who made this response.

Table 4

Student Teaching Experiences

	John Swett School[a]	My other placement
Positive experiences		
Support	5	2
School		2
Students		3
Opportunity to experiment	2	
Included in school community	5	
Treated professionally	3	
Opportunity to work in other classrooms	2	
Curriculum	1	2
Negative experiences		
lack of feedback or modeling	1	
lack of support		1
isolated within the school		2
Master teacher	2	2
teaching conditions	1	1
students	2	1
supervisor		1
philosophical differences	1	1
curriculum		1
Swett/Mills relationship	1	NA

[a] Numbers indicate number of subjects who responded to that category for each school.

Table 4 continued

Interactions within the School Community		
with other teachers	7	4
Social		2
Collaboration	4	2

Table 5

Effects of Participating in the Partnership

N=6

Do you have expanded opportunities?	
Yes	6[a]
No	0

What are they?

What are they?	
Expands view of self as educator	3
Opportunity for professional growth	4
Opportunity to put theory into practice	1

View of principal	
Bridge between the Master teacher and student teacher	5
Bridge between Mills College and John Swett school	3
Facilitator	2

[a] Number of teachers who gave the response.

References

Clark, R.W. (1988). School-University relationships: An interpretive review. In K.A. Sirotnik & J.I. Goodlad (Eds.), School-University Partnerships in action: Concepts, cases and concerns. (pp.32-65). New York: Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1988). Policy and professionalism. In Ann Lieberman (Ed.), Building a professional culture in schools. New York: Teachers College Press.

Gifford, B.R. (1987). Editor's introduction. In Education and urban society. (pp.363-367). SAGE Publications. Newbury Park.

Gifford, B.R. & Gabelko, N.H. (1987). Linking practice-sensitive researchers to researcher-sensitive practitioners. In Education and urban society. (pp.368-388). SAGE Publications. Newbury Park.

(1987). Research into research: SUPER project case studies. In Education and urban society. (pp.389-420). SAGE Publications. Newbury Park.

Goodlad, J.I. (1988). School-University partnerships for educational renewal: Rationale and Concepts. In K.A. Sirotnik & J.I. Goodlad (Eds.), School-University partnerships in action: Concepts, cases and concerns. (pp.3-31). New York: Teachers College Press.

Goodlad, J.I. (1983). A place called school: prospects for the future. McGraw-Hill Book Company. New York.

Lieberman, A. (1986). Collaborative research: Working with, not working on... In Educational Leadership, 43, 28-32.

Lieberman, A. (1988). The metropolitan school study council: A living history. In K.A. Sirotnik & Goodlad (Eds.), School-University partnerships in action: Concepts, cases and concerns. (pp.169-190). New York: Teachers College Press.

Lieberman, A. (1989). On teacher empowerment: A conversation with Ann Lieberman. In Educational Leadership. Vol. 46, no. 8. May, 1989.

McLaughlin, M.W. & Yee, S.M.L. (1988). School as a place to have a career. In Ann Lieberman (Ed.), Building a professional culture in schools. New York. Teachers College Press.

Schlechty, R.L. & Whitford, B.L. (1988). Shared problems and shared vision: Organic collaboration. In K.A. Sirotnik & Goodlad (Eds.), School-University partnerships in action: Concepts, cases, and concerns. (pp.191-204). New York: Teachers College Press.

Sinclair, R.L.& Harrison, A.E.(1988). A partnership for increasing studentlearning: The Massachusetts coalition for school improvement. In K.A. Sirotnik & J.I.Goodlad (Eds.) School-University partnerships in action: Concepts, cases and concerns. (pp.87-105). New York: Teachers College Press.

Sirotnik,K.A.(1988). The meaning and conduct of inquiry in school-university partnerships. In K.A.Sirotnik & J.I.Goodlad (Eds.), School-University partnerships in action: Concepts, cases and concerns. (pp.169-190). New York: Teachers College Press.

Sirotnik,K.A.& Goodlad,J.I.(1988). Introduction to School-University partnerships in action: Concepts, cases and concerns. (pp.vii-xii). New York: Teachers College Press.

Task force on teaching as a profession.(1986). A nation prepared:Teachers for the 21st century. Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Wesley,E.B.(1957). NEA: The first hundred years. Harper Brothers. New York.

Williams,D.D.(1988). The Brigham Young university-public school partnership. In K.A.Sirotnik & Goodlad,J.I. (Eds.), School-University partnerships in action: Concepts, cases and concerns. (pp.124-147). New York: Teachers College Press.

Questionnaire for Partnership Master Teachers

1. What are your reasons for being a master teacher?

2. How do you view your role as a master teacher?

3. What are your responsibilities as a master teacher and a member of the partnership?

   a. To your student teacher

   b. To other student teachers at the school

   c. To Mills College

4. What do you know about the coursework at Mills for the student teachers?

5. Does your knowledge of the coursework affect how you interact with the student teacher?

6. What ideas have you suggested be included in the student preparation program?

Which ideas have been acted on?

Have any of these ideas been implemented?

How do you evaluate their success?

7. Do you have expanded opportunities as a result of the partnership?

If so, what are they?

8. How does having a student teacher affect your relationship

a. with the school district?

b. With your colleagues?

9. How do you think Margaret's dual role as principal and supervisor affected your relationships with your student teachers?

Questionnaire for Master Teachers

1. What are your reasons for being a master teacher?

2. How do you view your role as a master teacher?

3. What are your responsibilities as a master teacher ?

   a. To your student teacher

   b. To other student teachers at the school

   c. To Mills College

4. What do you know about the coursework at Mills for the student teachers?

5. Does your knowledge of the coursework affect how you interact with the student teacher?

6. What ideas have you suggested be included in the student preparation program?

   Which ideas have been acted on?

   Have any of these ideas been implemented?

   How do you evaluate their success?

7. How does having a student teacher affect your relationship

   a. with the school district?

   b. With your colleagues?

Questionnaire for Former Student Teachers

1. What were your positive experiences at Swett as a student teacher?

What were your negative experiences at Swett as a student teacher?

2. What were your positive experiences at your other student teaching placement?

What were your negative experiences at your other student teaching placement?

3. How do you think Margaret's dual role as principal and supervisor affected your student teaching experiences?

4. Did you feel that your master teachers at Swett had more knowledge of your coursework than your other master teachers?

Did that knowledge affect your total student teacher experience at Swett? How?

5. What relationship between the Swett faculty and the Mills faculty did you experience?

How did it affect your experience as a student teacher?

6. While you were at Swett did other teachers interact with you, besides your master teacher?

In what way?

7. While you were at your other school for a placement, did teachers other than your master teacher interact with you?

In what way?

8. Were there any administrators with whom you interacted during either placement?

How were they helpful?